

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 14-15, and 37-61 are now pending in the application with claims 1-4, 7-9, 11, 15, 37-58, and 61 having been withdrawn. Claims 5, 10, 14, and 59 are currently amended. No claims are cancelled or newly added by this amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

The Examiner has withdrawn claims 11, 15, and 61 under 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed. Applicant reflects these non-elected claims as having been withdrawn in the listing of the claims. Applicant withdraws claims 11, 15, and 61 without prejudice and reserves the right to prosecute these claims at a later date.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

Claims 5, 6 and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Holmes (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0116610; "Holmes"). Claims 10, 14 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes in view of Ono (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0035685; "Ono"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts on pages 3-4 ("Response to Arguments") that all the limitations of the "storing unit/storing" recited in claims 5, 10, 14, and 59 are disclosed in Holmes. The portions of Holmes pointed out by the Examiner seem to disclose (i) the address information, (ii) the public key certificate, and (iii) the validity period, but fail to

disclose that (iv) the validity period of the address information is identical to that of the public key certificate.

Specifically, paragraph [0035] of Holmes pointed out by the Examiner discloses that “The Basic Certificate may include other fields that have not been shown. Such fields include, for example, a validity field specifying the period of validity of the digital certificate, a version field, etc.” Therefore, Holmes discloses the “period of validity of the digital certificate.” However, Holmes fails to suggest or disclose that the period of validity of the address information is identical to that of the digital certificate. Accordingly, Holmes and Ono, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “a storing unit that stores/storing the address information and the public key certificate of the first communication device with a validity period of the address information being set to be identical to that of the public key certificate” recited in claims 5, 10, 14, and 59.

For at least the above reason, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 6, and 59, and claims 10, 14, and 60, define patentable subject matter over Holmes, and the combination of Holmes and Ono, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 6, 2009

By: /Gregory A. Stobbs/_____
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/dec

14736060.1